DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 089 493 EC 061 408

AUTHOR	Haskins, Jimmy B.; Friel, Charles M.
TITLE	The Mentally Retarded and the Juvenile Court Project CAMIO, Volume 7.
INSTITUTION	Sam Houston State Univ., Huntsville, Tex. Inst. of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences.; Texas State Dept. of Mental Health and Mental Retardation, Mexica. Mexica State School.
SPONS AGENCY	Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Div. of Mental Retardation.
PUB DATE	Dec 73
NOTE	86p.; For other Project CAMIO documents see EC 061402 through 061407 and EC061409
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; Agency Role; Community Services; *Delinquents; *Exceptional Child Research; Incidence; Intelligence Differences; *Juvenile Courts; *Mentally Handicapped; Probation Officers
IDENTIFIERS	*Project CAMIO; Texas

ABSTRACT

Studied was the relationship of the mentally retarded (MR) and the juvenile court through an attempt to determine the incidence of MR juveniles adjudicated by the juvenile court in one metropolitan county in Texas, to determine the attitude of juvenile probation officers toward the MR delinquent, and to determine the availability of community resources for the care of MR delinquents. Intelligence tests administered to all (48) juveniles adjudicated during a 4-month period revealed that the incidence of MR was about five times higher than in the general population. The MR juveniles tended to come from poorer homes, to have been first arrested at an earlier age, but arrested fewer times than the non-MR juveniles. After one year on probation 2/3 of the MR juveniles compared to 1/2 of the non-MR juveniles, were committed to state training schools. Juvenile probation officers queried appeared to view the prognosis for the MR delinquent as poor, to be unfamiliar with mental retardation, and to view state residential facilities for the retarded as of little assistance to the court. The officers indicated the most significant problems were the lack of community resources and the uncooperative attitudes of parents. Interviews with directors of community based programs showed that directors of agencies for the MR were reluctant to extend services to the delinquent and that directors of agencies dealing with delinquents were reluctant to extend services to the retarded. (DB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 089493

The Mentally Retarded and the Juvenile Court

PROJECT CAMIO
Volume 7

PROJECT CAMIO

CORRECTIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND THE MENTALLY INCOMPETENT OFFENDER

Jimmy R. Haskins, Ed.D.
Project Director
Superintendent
Brenham State School
Texas Department of Mental
Health and Mental Retardation

Charles M. Friel, Ph.D.
Associate Project Director
Director of Research
Institute of Contemporary Corrections
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas

Don E. Kirkpatrick, Ph.D.
Project Coordinator

Wade E. French, M.A.
Principal Researcher

December 1973

This project was supported by funds from Research Grant No. RO1-MR-07006, Division of Mental Retardation, Rehabilitation Services Administration, Social and Rehabilitation Services, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The investigation was conducted through an affiliation between Mexia State School of the Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation and the Institute of Contemporary Corrections at Sam Houston State University.

Graphic Design by Beth Bartosh

The Mentally Retarded and the Juvenile Court

PROJECT CAMIO

Volume 7

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The purpose of the present study was to determine the impact of the mentally retarded juvenile offender on the juvenile court. The study was conducted in Jefferson County which is one of the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas identified by the United States Bureau of the Census. The authors wish to express their appreciation to the many agencies and their associated directors in the Beaumont area who lent both their time and interest to the conduct of this study. These include the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Beaumont State Center for Human Development, the Texas Vocational Rehabilitation Commission, the Texas Youth Council, the special education departments of the local school districts, Family and Child Services of Beaumont, the Buckner Baptist Benevolence Association, Goodwill Industries, Fairway Halfway House, Inc., Services Unlimited, Inc., and the Beaumont Neurological Center.

In addition, the authors wish to express their appreciation to the Juvenile Court of Jefferson County and, in particular, to Mr. Charles Hawkes, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer of Jefferson County.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
1.0	GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS OF MENTAL RETARDATION AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY	1
1.1	Statement of Problem	1
1.2	Purpose of the Study	7
1.3	Basic Questions	7
1.4	Methods and Procedures	8
2.0	ANALYSIS OF FACTORS SURVEYED	12
2.1	Results of the Sample	12
2.1.1	Baseline Characteristics	12
2.1.2	Racial Characteristics	14
2.1.3	Family Status	14
2.1.4	Family Income	15
2.1.5	Receiving Public Assistance	17
2.1.6	Siblings with Police Referrals	19
2.1.7	Age at Time of First Police Referral	20
2.1.8	Number of Police Referrals at Time of Adjudication	21
2.1.9	Type of Offense	23
2.1.10	Placement in a Correctional Institution One Year Later	25
2.2	The Retarded Delinquent and the Probation Officer	26
3.0	SURVEY OF EXISTING COMMUNITY RESOURCES	36
3.1	Public Agencies	36
3.2	Private Agencies	42
4.0	SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	48
4.1	Summary	48
4.2	Recommendations	50

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

PAGE

FOOTNOTES..... 57

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 60

APPENDIXES

Appendix A. Illustrative Case Histories..... 63
Appendix B. Sample Profile Sheet..... 72
Appendix C. Sample Questionnaire..... 74

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Comparison of Groups According to the Factors of Race, Family Status, and Family Income.....	16
2.	Comparison of Groups According to the Factors of Receiving Public Assistance, Siblings and Police Referrals, and Age at the Time of First Referral.....	18
3.	Comparison of Groups According to the Factors of Number of Referrals, Type of Offense, and Placed in Correctional Institution.....	22
4.	Comparison of Groups According to Specific Adjudicated Offenses.....	24
5.	Responses of Probation Officers to the Questionnaire.....	28
6.	Priorities for Implementation of Recommendations.....	56

1.0 GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS OF MENTAL RETARDATION AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Juvenile delinquency is one of the most pressing social problems that troubles American Society today. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice estimated in its 1967 report that "one in every nine youths -- one in every six male youths, will be referred to juvenile courts in connection with a delinquent act (excluding traffic offenses) before his 18th birthday."[1] Much time, money, and human energy has been invested in seeking out the cause or causes of juvenile delinquency. Almost every conceivable aspect of the delinquent has been scrutinized from his body chemistry to his family and community. One aspect that has been persistently studied is the relationship between mental retardation and delinquency.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Mental retardation is a major social, economic, and educational problem. It affects directly or indirectly thirty out of every one thousand citizens in the United States.[2] While the exact number of retarded individuals is not known, it is estimated that there are six million retarded persons in the United States and their numbers increase by 126,000 every year.[3] In 1970 there were 186,743 retarded persons in public institutions for the retarded at a cost in excess of eighty-seven million dollars.[4] In Texas in 1970 there were over ten thousand persons in public institutions for the retarded with an annual expenditure of over thirty-six million dollars.[5] Over 900,000, twenty-one out of every thousand, students in United States public schools were

classified as mentally retarded and placed in special education programs.[6] It was estimated that only three percent of the retarded individuals in the United States were cared for in institutions. The remaining ninety-seven percent of the retarded individuals in the United States were cared for in the community.[7] Eighty-five percent of the people who were diagnosed as mentally retarded fell within the mild (I.Q. of 53-69) category of retardation.[8]

The argument as to whether mental retardation causes crime and delinquency, or is only incidental to it, has raged for decades. Although speculative research had gone on for some time, it was not until the development of the formal intelligence test in the early part of the twentieth century that crudely scientific studies of the relationship between mental retardation and delinquency could be carried out. The most notable of all intelligence tests, was the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale. With this and several other new testing instruments, many conflicting conclusions were reached. Dr. H. Goddard declared in 1919 after doing extensive intelligence testing among the populations of adult and juvenile correctional institutions, that "...it is no longer to be denied that the greatest single cause of delinquency and crime is low grade mentality, much of it within the limits of feeble-mindedness."[9] Dr. Goddard was to conclude later that at least "50% of all criminals are mentally defective."[10] He went on to say that "even if a much smaller percent is defective, it is sufficient for our argument that without question one point of attack for the solution of the

crime problem is the problem of feeble-mindedness."[11]

Goddard by no means had the last word on the impact of feeble-mindedness on crime. As the development and use of intelligence tests proliferated, so did the number of studies of mental retardation and its role as a causative factor in criminality. The study that yielded what was considered the most accurate estimate of the number of delinquents who were retarded was Gluecks' classic study, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency, published in 1950. In this study, it was found that five percent of delinquents studied were bright, fifty-three percent were normal, thirty-two percent were dull normal, and ten percent were mentally defective.[12] Brown and Courtless' study in 1967 of 200 American prisons and training schools found that nine and one-half percent of the inmates were mentally retarded as compared to three percent of the general population. Nearly 1500 (1.6 percent) of the inmates had IQs below fifty-five.[13]

In his study of mentally retarded delinquents, O.J. Smith came to the conclusion that rather than having propensities for crime, mentally retarded individuals may be involved in crime and delinquency as a result of lack of insight, misunderstanding, or lack of appropriate supervision. He went on to say that "society must become concerned with 'life' rather than just school planning for mentally retarded individuals."[14] In his article, "Behavior Disorders in Mental Retardation" Delton Beir stated:

> At the present time only one conclusion regarding the association of mental retardation and delinquency and crime seems justifiable. The mentally retarded are quite as capable of delinquent or criminal acts as is

> their mentally normal brethren: however, factors other than intellectual ones appear to be more important in the etiology of such behavior and these factors are those commonly cited as important to the development of delinquent and criminal behavior in the general population.[15]

The President's Panel on Mental Retardation in 1963 concluded:

> There is usually no essential relationship between mental retardation and other disorders of human behavior such as mental illness or delinquency. There are several factors, however, which can contribute to the incidence of behavioral disorders among the mentally retarded. The intellectually retarded person is predisposed to a life of failure in our highly competitive culture and, in compensation, may develop failure-avoidance patterns of behavior which could be categorized as emotionally disturbed. Sometimes, the retarded child may develop compensatory aggressive or withdrawal patterns as a result of being rejected by his peers or even members of his own family... The vast majority of the retarded are persons reared in slums or other depressed environments; they are, therefore, exposed to the same factors which increase crime and delinquency, alcoholism, drug abuse, mental illness, prostitution, etc., in these environments.[16]

Even though the mentally retarded delinquent represents a small percentage of the total delinquent population they are often the most difficult client the juvenile probation officer has to work with. The mentally retarded delinquent presents problems to the community as well as to institutions for the retarded and the offender. The initial problem is usually in deciding who is responsible for the mentally retarded delinquent. While the law appears to make provisions for such situations, in practice the issue is really an unsolved one. When a mentally retarded child appears in the Juvenile Court in Texas, the law makes the following provisions:

> The Court may cause any person coming under its jurisdiction to be examined by a physician, psy-

> chiatrist, or psychologist, appointed by the Court. If it is determined that the child is either feeble-minded or mentally ill, it shall be the duty of the Judge of the Juvenile Court to proceed to have the necessary steps taken to have said child adjudged feeble-minded or insane.[17]

When a mentally retarded child is committed to the Texas Youth Council, the law makes the following provisions:

> Whenever the Youth Council finds that any child committed to it is mentally ill, feeble-minded, or an epileptic, the Youth Council shall have the power to return such child to the Court of Original Jurisdiction for appropriate disposition or shall have the power to request the court in the county in which the training school is located to take such action as the condition of the child requires. In no case will the Youth Council upon a determination of such a finding related to any such child committed to its custody delay returning the child to the committing county or make application to the proper court for appropriate handling of the case beyond the minimum time necessary for the removal of the child from its facility according to the law.[18]

It would appear that an appropriate procedure has been established for the handling of the retarded delinquent. The only problem is that there is only a limited amount of bed space in the state institutions for the retarded. When they are full, there are no recourses available to the Juvenile Court. As a matter of expediency and often necessity, the retarded delinquent is usually committed to the Texas Youth Council. This is often done in hopes that the Youth Council can effect an "administrative transfer" of the child to a school for the retarded. An administrative transfer means that administrative personnel of the Youth Council can contact administrative personnel of the Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation and have the child placed without having to go through

the "red tape" and waiting list that goes with initiating placement at the local level. Unfortunately, with limited bed space in the schools for the retarded, these children usually remain in a Youth Council facility.

It would seem that if an individual was considered retarded enough to be committed to a state school for the retarded, he would not be tried as an adult criminal or juvenile delinquent under the present law. The Mentally Retarded Persons Act of Texas defines a mentally retarded person as "any person other than a mentally ill person, so mentally deficient from any cause as to require special training, education, supervision, treatment, care, or control for his own or the community's welfare."[19] According to the legal definition, mentally retarded persons who are in special education classes for the educable mentally retarded should not be subject to commitment to the Texas Youth Council. Not only the retarded, but also the mentally ill offender is quite often deposited in the Criminal Justice System because it seems to be the only institution that is physically capable of controlling such individuals. Once they enter the system, there is little chance of removing them due to the lack of appropriate resources specially designed to meet their needs and deal with their problems. As the point of entry into the Criminal Justice System is on the local or community level, it would appear that this would be the level where an effort should be made to reroute such people out of the Criminal Justice System and toward appropriate resources. "Justice is blind if it does not inquire into the significance

of mental retardation as a relevant circumstance, and impotent if it has no dispositional variants suited to the conditions it finds."[20]

The experience of many juvenile probation officers indicates that such resources do not appear to exist. Those community level resources that do exist for the care and treatment of the mentally retarded child do not appear to be programmed or willing to work with mentally retarded delinquents. As a result, these children are committed to the Texas Youth Council by default due to the lack of community resources to care for them. Once they are released from the Youth Council, the problem is not solved because the child's stay with the Youth Council does not change his status of being retarded and the community resources still do not exist to serve his needs.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe the mentally retarded delinquent as compared to non-retarded delinquents, to describe some of the unique needs of the retarded delinquent, to document the lack of community-based resources to meet the unique needs of the retarded delinquent, and make recommendations to meet these needs.

1.3 Basic Questions

In order to document the existence of the unique needs of the retarded delinquent and the lack of adequate community-based resources to meet these needs, this study will address itself to

answering three basic questions:

1. Do mentally retarded delinquents differ from non-retarded delinquents and thus require specialized treatment?
2. What resources are available for the treatment of the mentally retarded delinquent at the community level?
3. What are some of the problems that the juvenile probation officer encounters when trying to work with the mentally retarded delinquent?

1.4 Methods and Procedures

The sample population for this study consisted of those children declared delinquent by the Juvenile Court of Jefferson County, Texas, between September 1, 1970 and December 30, 1970. A detailed discussion of the sample population is taken up in Section 2.0. Each child who was included in this study was given the Slosson Intelligence Test for Children and Adults.[21] The S.I.T. was chosen as the testing instrument because of its ease of administration and because it is orally administered and thus does not rely on reading ability. Furthermore, the publishers report a .92 correlation with the Stanford-Binet form L-M, 1960 edition.[22]

After each child was tested, information concerning family structure and socio-economic position and delinquent history was recorded from information obtained from the child's case folder and police records. A sample profile sheet that was

used to tabulate the data is included in Appendix B. A follow-up study to determine if the child was in a correctional institution one year after his initial court hearing was conducted. This information was tabulated and a comparison was made between children classified as mentally retarded, borderline to dull normal, and normal based on their S.I.T. I.Q. scores.

In order to establish the specific problems that the juvenile probation officer encounters when dealing with the mentally retarded delinqunet, questionnaires were sent to the Houston, Dallas, San Antonio, and Austin, Texas juvenile probation departments. Nine of the questions required specific answers, and the tenth was open-ended.

In order to survey the resources available for the community-based treatment of subjects of this study, interviews were held with the supervisors and administrators of the eleven agencies in the county that might be able to provide services to these children. The agencies surveyed in the public sphere were:

1. Neighborhood Youth Corps
2. Beaumont State Center for Human Development
3. Texas Vocational Rehabilitation Commission
4. Texas Youth Council
5. Special Education Departments of the Local School Districts
6. Family and Children Services of Beaumont

In the private sphere the agencies contacted were:

1. Buckner Baptist Benevolence

2. Goodwill Industries, Inc.

3. Fairway Halfway House

4. Services Unlimited, Inc.

5. Beaumont Neurological Center

Surveys of these organizations were carried out through personal interviews with the emphasis placed on ascertaining if the agency has programs for the mentally retarded delinquent, what problems they encounter in trying to work with the mentally retarded delinquent, and any suggestions for programs they might have. Based on the information obtained in the above mentioned procedures, conclusions were drawn, and, based on these conclusions, recommendations were formulated. Case histories of three delinquents are included in Appendix A in order to illustrate the problems the probation officer encounters in working with these children.

Definition of Major Terms

Definition of terms presents a special problem to this study, especially in regard to the term "mental retardation." It was observed during background reading that mental retardation seemed to be defined by the different researchers and clinicians in terms of their own discipline. The following definitions will be used throughout this study. The mentally retarded child is one who scores within the mentally deficient or defective range of intelligence as defined by the test publishers. For the S.I.T., this is an I.Q. of below 70.

A delinquent child is one who was adjudicated delinquent pursuant

to Art. 2338, Sec. 3, Subsections A through G, Vernon's Annotated Civil Statutes.[23]

Community resources are all public, private, or volunteer agencies located within Jefferson County or closely adjoined, that do, or could, provide service for the physical care, education, vocational training, and social adjustment of a mentally retarded child.

2.0 ANALYSIS OF THE FACTORS SURVEYED

A sample population of children adjudicated delinquent in Jefferson County was compiled in order to compare the mentally retarded delinquents with those delinquents who scored above the mentally deficient level on the intelligence test administered. The latter part of the chapter surveys probation officers' opions about retardation and intelligence tests and the problems they encountered when working with their retarded clients. It was hoped that the information gathered from these surveys would point up the special problems the mentally retarded child poses on probation and help in the formulation of recommendations that might better serve those retarded children with behavioral problems.

2.1 Results of the Sample

The sample population for this study included all forty-eight children who were adjudicated delinquent in the Juvenile Court of Jefferson County, Texas, between September 1, 1970, and December 30, 1970. This represented thirty-five percent of the juvenile cases adjudicated delinquent for the year 1970. Cases that were not adjudicated or cases continued on the court's docket were not included in this study.

2.1.1 Baseline Characteristics

The forty-eight children in the sample population were all given the Slosson Intelligence Test for Children and Adults. Those children who obtained IQs of below seventy were placed in the mentally retarded group. This represented fifteen children and

thirty-one percent of the total sample population. Children who obtained IQs of between seventy and eighty-nine were placed in the borderline to dull normal category. Although the borderline and dull normal groups are separate categories in most intelligence tests, they are treated together for the purpose of this study because the groups were small and their characteristics quite similar. There were fifteen children in this group, representing thirty-one percent of the sample population. Children who obtained IQs of ninety or above were placed in the mentally normal group. This group of eighteen children made up thirty-seven percent of the sample population. None of the sample children tested scored above the average range of intelligence. All other data used for this study were taken from case folders and police records.

Although the number of factors for comparison of the children could be almost infinite, nine were selected for this study. These factors were selected because it was believed that they had potential implication for the development of treatment programs for mentally retarded delinquents. The three groups -- mentally retarded youths, borderline to dull normal youths, and mentally normal youths -- were compared on the basis of race, family status, family income, whether receiving public assistance, siblings with police referrals, age at the time of first police referral, number of referrals at the time of adjudication, type of offense, and whether the child was placed in a correctional institution one year latter.

2.1.2 Racial Characteristics

Of the fifteen children in the mentally retarded group, fourteen were Negro and one was Caucasian. No Mexican-Americans were represented in this group. In the borderline to dull normal group, there were nine Negros and six Caucasians. The mentally normal group contained two Negroes, fifteen Caucasians, and one Mexican-American.

Although broad conclusions cannot be drawn due to the small size of the sample, it is clear that a much larger proportion of the mentally retarded delinquents were members of minority groups than those in the other groups. Table 1 shows the racial breakdown of the three groups. Ninety-three percent of the mentally retarded delinquents were Negro compared to sixty percent in the borderline to dull normal group and eleven percent in the normal group.

2.1.3 Family Status

Only two of the fifteen children in the mentally retarded group resided in an intact family, one where both the natural mother and father were present. Twelve resided in families where only the natural mother was present and one resided in a home where the natural parent and a step-parent were present. Of the fifteen children comprising the borderline to dull normal group, seven members resided in a family where the natural mother was present, and four where the child resided with a natural parent and a step-parent. Ten of the eighteen members of the mentally normal group resided in a home where both natural parents were present,

five resided with the natural mother alone, and three resided with a natural parent and a step-parent. This breakdown is illustrated in Table 1.

Children in the mentally retarded group more often came from families headed by women than did those in the other two groups. Eighty percent of the mentally retarded children resided in families in which no father was present compared to twenty-six percent of the borderline to dull normal group and twenty-eight percent of the normal group. The mentally normal children resided in intact families more often than the children in other groups. Fifty-five percent of the mentally normal group came from intact families, compared to thirteen percent of the mentally retarded group and forty-seven percent of the borderline to dull normal group.

2.1.4 Family Income

The annual income of the families of the sample children was tabulated and the children were placed in five groups: those with an annual reported income of less than $3,000; those with an income of between $3,000 and $4,000; those with an income of between $4,000 and $6,000; those with an income of between $6,000 and $8,000; and those with an annual income of above $8,000. The breakdown of the children according to income is shown in Table 1. Ten of the fifteen children in the mentally retarded group came from families with an annual income of below $3,000; one had an income of between $3,000 and $4,000; two had incomes between $4,000 and $6,000; two had incomes between $6,000 and

TABLE 1

Comparison of Groups According to the Factors of Race, Place of Residence, and Family Income

Factors	Mentally Retarded Group		Borderline-Dull Normal Group		Normal Group		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Race:								
Negro	14	93	9	60	2	11	25	52
Caucasian	1	7	6	40	15	83	22	46
Mexican American	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	2
Family Status:								
Natural Parents	2	13	7	47	10	55	19	39
Natural Mother Only	12	80	4	26	5	28	21	44
Natural Parent and Step-Parent	1	7	4	26	3	17	8	17
Family Income:								
Below $3,000	10	67	3	20	2	11	15	31
Between $3,000-$4,000	1	7	2	13	1	5	4	8
Between $4,000-$6,000	2	13	4	26	5	28	11	23
Between $6,000-$8,000	2	13	3	20	5	28	10	21
Above $8,000	0	0	3	20	5	28	8	17

$8,000; and none had a reported family income of above $8,000. Three of the fifteen children in the borderline to dull normal group resided in families with a reported yearly income of less than $3,000; two had incomes of between $3,000 and $4,000; four had incomes of between $4,000 and $6,000; three had incomes of between $6,000 and $8,000; and three had yearly incomes of over $8,000. Two of the eighteen children in the mentally normal group resided in families that had a reported family income of below $3,000 a year; one had an income of between $3,000 and $4,000; five had incomes of between $4,000 and $6,000; five had incomes of between $6,000 and $8,000; and five had yearly incomes in excess of $8,000.

The mentally retarded children in this sample more often came from families with a smaller annual reported income than did the children of the other groups. It was found that sixty-seven percent of the mentally retarded delinquents came from families with less than $3,000 a year income, while only twenty percent of the borderline to dull normal group and eleven percent of the mentally normal group came from families with a reported yearly income of less than $3,000. None of the mentally retarded delinquents came from families with a reported annual income of more than $8,000, while twenty percent of the borderline to dull normal group and twenty-eight percent of the normal group came from families with a reported annual income of above $8,000.

2.1.5 Receiving Public Assistance

The families of the children in the sample were analyzed to see

TABLE 2

Comparison of Groups According to the Factors of Receiving Public Assistance, Siblings and Police Referrals, and Age at the Time of First Referral

Factors	Mentally Retarded Group		Borderline-Dull Normal Group		Normal Group		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Receiving Public Assistance								
Yes	10	67	4	26	2	11	16	33
No	5	33	11	73	16	89	32	67
Siblings and Police Referrals								
With	9	60	8	53	8	44	25	52
Without	6	40	7	47	10	55	23	48
Age at Time of First Police Referral								
Thirteen or Younger	10	67	8	53	7	39	25	52
Fourteen or Older	5	33	7	47	11	61	23	48

if they were receiving public assistance. Table 2 shows the breakdown of the three groups on the factor of their families receiving public assistance. Ten of the children in the mentally retarded group resided in families receiving public assistance, while five did not. Four children in the borderline to dull normal group resided in families receiving public assistance, while eleven did not. Two of the children in the mentally normal group came from families receiving public assistance, while sixteen did not.

The children in the mentally retarded group more often came from families who were receiving public assistance than did the children in the other two groups. Sixty-seven percent of the mentally retarded youths resided in families receiving public assistance compared to twenty-six percent of the youths in the borderline to dull normal group and eleven percent of the mentally normal group.

2.1.6 Siblings with Police Referrals

The children in the sample were analyzed to see if their brothers or sisters had recorded referrals to the police. The results of this check are shown in Table 2. Nine members of the mentally retarded group had siblings with recorded police referrals, while the other six did not. Of the fifteen children in the borderline to dull normal group, eight had siblings who had been referred to the police. Eight of the eighteen children in the mentally normal group had siblings with police referrals, while ten did not.

There was less difference between the groups on this factor than there was on most of the others. The children in the mentally retarded groups stood a slightly better chance of having siblings who had been referred to the police than did the children in the other groups. Sixty percent of the mentally retarded group had siblings with recorded police referrals compared to fifty-three percent of the borderline to dull normal group and forty-four percent of the mentally normal group.

2.1.7 Age at Time of First Police Referral

The sample population was tabulated to see at what age the children were first referred to the police. They were placed in two groups: those who were first referred to the police at age thirteen or younger and those who were first referred to the police at age fourteen or older. Table 2 shows the breakdown of the figures for the sample population on this factor. Ten of the fifteen children in the mentally retarded group had been first referred to the police before the age of fourteen. Seven members of the borderline to dull normal group had first been referred to the police at age thirteen or older, while eight were fourteen or older at the time of their first police referral. Seven of the members of the mentally normal group had their first police referral before age fourteen and eleven had their first police referral when they were fourteen or older.

The mentally retarded youths appear to start committing offenses at an earlier age, or at least are apprehended at an earlier age, than the youths with borderline to dull normal intelligence or

normal intelligence. Sixty-seven percent of the mentally retarded group were younger than fourteen at the time of their first referral compared to fifty-three percent of the borderline to dull normal group and thirty-nine percent of the mentally normal group.

2.1.8 Number of Police Referrals at Time of Adjudication

Data were collected on the number of referrals to the police the youths had had at the time of their adjudication as delinquent. They were divided into two categories: (1) those youths who had four or more police referrals at the time of their adjudication and (2) those who had three or less. Table 3 shows the breakdown of the sample population on this factor. Three of the mentally retarded children had four or more police referrals at the time of their adjudication as delinquent, while twelve had three or less police referrals. Eight members of the borderline to dull normal group had four or more police referrals at the time of their adjudication, while seven had three or less police referrals. Ten youths in the mentally normal group had four or more referrals to the police at the time of their adjudication and eight had three or less police referrals.

The children in the mentally retarded group generally had fewer police referrals at the time of their adjudication as delinquent than did the other two groups. Only twenty percent of the mentally retarded youths had four or more referrals to the police at the time of the adjudication as compared to fifty-three percent of the borderline to dull normal youths and fifty-five percent of the

TABLE 3

Comparison of Groups According to the Factors of Number of Referrals, Type of Offense, and Placed in Correctional Institution

Factors	Mentally Retarded Group		Borderline-Dull Normal Group		Normal Group		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Number of Referrals at Time of Adjudication								
Four or More	3	20	8	53	10	55	21	44
Three or Less	12	80	7	47	8	44	27	56
Type of Offense								
Primarily Against Property	13	87	12	80	10	55	35	73
Primarily Against Person	2	13	2	13	0	0	4	8
Victimless	0	0	1	7	8	44	9	19
Placed in Correctional Institution One Year Later								
Yes	9	60	2	13	9	50	20	42
No	6	40	13	87	9	50	28	58

mentally normal youths having four or more police referrals at the time of their adjudication.

2.1.9 Type of Offense

The offense for which each juvenile was adjudicated was placed in one of three categories: (1) those offenses committed primarily against property such as shoplifting, burglary, and driving without owner's consent; (2) offenses committed primarily against persons such as armed robbery and assault, (3) and victimless crimes or those committed primarily against the child himself such as runaway or possession of dangerous drugs. The breakdown of these three types of offenses for the sample groups is shown in Table 3. Thirteen of the mentally retarded youths were adjudicated for committing crimes primarily against property, two had committed offenses primarily against persons, and none had committed victimless offenses. Twelve of the children in the borderline to dull normal group had committed offenses against persons, and one had committed a victimless crime. Ten of the youths in the mentally normal group had committed offenses primarily against property, none had committed offenses against persons, and eight had committed victimless offenses.

Children from all three groups had been adjudicated more often for crimes against property than against persons or against themselves. The mentally retarded children had a higher percentage of crimes against property, eighty-seven percent compared to eighty percent in the borderline to dull normal group and fifty-five percent in the mentally normal group. The mentally

TABLE 4

Comparison of Groups According to Specific Adjudicated Offense

	Mentally Retarded Group		Borderline-Dull Normal Group		Normal Group		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Burglary	7	46	8	13	4	22	13	27
Shoplifting	4	26	4	26	1	5	9	19
Robbery by Assault	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	2
Destruction of Property	1	7	1	7	1	5	3	6
Driving Without Owner's Consent	1	7	3	20	4	22	8	17
Armed Robbery	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	2
Theft	0	0	2	13	0	0	2	4
Assault	0	0	1	7	0	0	1	2
Carrying Prohibited Weapon	0	0	1	7	0	0	1	2
Runaway	0	0	1	7	4	22	5	10
Possession of Dangerous Drugs	0	0	0	0	4	22	4	8

retarded children had committed none of the victimless crimes compared to seven percent of the borderline to dull normal group and forty-four percent of the mentally normal group committing such crimes.

Although consideration of the specific offense for which the children were adjudicated is not a separate factor of this study, it is interesting to note the types of crimes the three groups tended to commit. Table 4 illustrates the specific adjudicated offenses for the three groups. Burglary was the most frequently committed offense overall but this crime was committed more often by the mentally retarded children than the children of the other groups with forty-six percent of the mentally retarded children committing this offense compared to thirteen percent for the borderline to dull normal group and twenty-two percent for the mentally normal children. Shoplifting was the second most frequently committed offense comprising nineteen percent of the total crimes of the forty-eight children. The mentally retarded and borderline to dull normal children were more often adjudicated for this offense than were the mentally normal children. Runaway and possession of dangerous drugs were offenses most often committed by the mentally normal children than those children of the other two groups. These two offenses comprised forty-four percent of the total offenses committed by the mentally normal group compared to only seven percent of the borderline to dull normal group and none of the mentally retarded children.

2.1.10 Placement in a Correctional Institution One Year Later

The last factor analyzed for this study was whether or not the

sample children had been placed in a correctional institution one year after their adjudication as delinquent. Table 3 shows the comparison of the three groups on this factor. Nine of the fifteen mentally retarded children were found to have been placed in a correctional institution one year after their adjudication. Two members of the borderline to dull normal group were in a correctional institution one year later while thirteen were not. Nine of the mentally normal children were found to be in a correctional institution one year later, while nine were not.

The mentally retarded children were more often found in a correctional institution one year after their adjudication hearing than were the children in the other two groups. Sixty percent of the mentally retarded youths were found to be institutionalized compared to thirteen percent of the borderline to dull normal group and fifty percent of the mentally normal youths. Perhaps the reasons for this difference lie in the difficulty the probation officer has in working with the retarded delinquent.

2.2 The Retarded Delinquent and the Probation Officer

This section will consider the attitudes and opinions of the juvenile probation officer as they relate to working with the mentally retarded delinquent. Questionnaires were sent to the four largest juvenile probation departments in Texas: those in Austin, Dallas, Houston and San Antonio. Fifty of the sixty questionnaires sent were returned. One department returned eleven questionnaires, another thirteen, another fourteen, and another

twelve. A sample of the questionnaires sent to the probation departments is found in Appendix C. The questionnaires contained nine structured questions that required a definite answer. The tenth question was open-ended, giving the respondent an opportunity to express his own opinions and relate the experiences that he had encountered in working with retarded delinquents. Question one, two, and nine were intended to sample the general attitude of the probation officer towards retarded delinquents. Questions three and eight were designed to sample the probation officer's confidence in the tools used to diagnose mental deficiencies. Questions four and five were designed to obtain the juvenile probation officer's opinion regarding adequacy of services provided, and question six was designed to evaluate the probation officers for familiarity with state resources for mentally retarded delinquents. Question seven was designed to sample the probation officer's opinion about the need for special services for mentally retarded delinquents. The purpose of the tenth question, an open-ended one, was to see if there was any general agreement on problems involved in working with the mentally retarded delinquents.

Table 5 illustrates the responses of the probation officers on each of the ten questions. On question one, forty-two of the fifty respondents answered "yes" to the question, "Do you believe that mental ability is an important component of anti-social behavior?" Seven responded "no" and one respondent could not give a "yes" or "no" response, indicating that each case had to be considered on its own merits.

TABLE 5

Responses of Probation Officers to the Questionnaire

Question	Number	Percent
1. Do you believe that mental ability is an important component of anti-social behavior?		
Yes	42	84
No	7	14
Response not scorable	1	2
2. Do you consider a mentally retarded child who has been declared delinquent a good, average, or poor risk on probation?		
Good	0	0
Average	12	24
Poor	36	72
Response not scorable	2	4
3. Do you have confidence in the instruments, i.e., psychological test, that are currently used in measuring mental abilities?		
Yes	25	50
No	25	50
Response not scorable	0	0
4. Do you consider the facilities in your community adequate to work effectively with mentally retarded delinquents?		
Yes	6	12
No	44	88
Response not scorable	0	0

TABLE 5 -- Continued

Question	Number	Percent
5. Do you consider current state facilities, i.e., schools for the mentally retarded, adequate?		
Yes	4	8
No	44	88
Response not scorable	2	4
6. Are you acquainted with the resources available at the state level to work with the mentally retarded?		
Yes	35	70
No	15	30
Response not scorable	0	0
7. Do you consider the number of children who are referred that are mentally retarded sufficient to warrant a specific program designed to deal with these children?		
Yes	49	98
No	1	2
Response not scorable	0	0
8. Do you consider the present "cut off" scores for diagnosing mental retardation, 70 on the W.I.S.C., W.A.I.S., and Stanford Binet Form L-M, too high, too low, or about right?		
Too low	4	8
About right	26	52
Too high	19	38
Response not scorable	1	2

TABLE 5 -- Continued

Question	Number	Percent
9. Do you believe that delinquents who have been diagnosed as mentally retarded should be sent to a state training school, i.e., reform school, if they fail to make an adequate adjustment on probation?		
Yes	15	30
No	34	68
Response not scorable	1	2
10. List the three most difficult problems you feel are involved in trying to work with a mentally retarded child on probation.		
Lack of community resources	27	54
Lack of cooperation and understanding by parents	18	36
Child's inability to understand the consequences of his acts	14	28
Inability of probation officer to communicate with the child	13	26
School problems	13	26
Peer group exploitation	8	16
Placement facilities	7	14
Lack of understanding of probation rules	6	12

On question two, thirty-six respondents considered a mentally retarded child who is declared delinqunet a poor risk on probation. Twelve respondents considered them average risks and two respondents were not definite in their responses. Each case had to be considered on its own merits. To question nine, "Do you feel that delinquents who have been diagnosed as mentally retarded should be sent to state training schools if they fail to make an adequate adjustment on probation?", fifteen respondents answered "yes", thirty-four answered "no", and one respondent failed to answer the question.

From the responses to the above questions, several inferences can be made. First, most of the workers in the field believe that mental ability is an important component in anti-social behavior. Second, mentally retarded delinquents are usually viewed as poor risks on probation. The response to the second question opens the door to the speculation that, given the idea that mentally retarded delinquents are poor risks on probation, the juvenile probation officer might not devote his best efforts to such cases when he has others on his caseload that may appear more promising. Question nine dealt with a rather sensitive matter. In a roundabout way it calls into question the adequacy of the programs provided by the Texas Youth Council. Most of the field workers felt that reform school was no place for a retarded child although there was often no other placement available. Twelve of those who responded "no", they did not favor state training schools for these children, made side comments on the questionnaire to the effect that usually there were no alternatives.

Questions three and eight were included to sample the juvenile probation officer's attitude toward the instruments used in diagnosing mental retardation. It was believed that the attitude of the probation officer toward psychological tests might color his attitudes toward the child diagnosed as mentally retarded. In essence if the worker does not have confidence in the instruments used to make the diagnosis, then the worker may have difficulty in formulating a plan for the retarded child that is within the range of the child's understanding and ability. To the question, "Do you have confidence in the instruments, i.e., psychological tests, that are currently used in measuring mental abilities?", twenty-five respondents said "yes" and twenty-five said "no". To the question, "Do you consider the present 'cut off' scores for diagnosing mental retardation, 70 on the W.I.S.C., W.A.I.S., and Stanford-Binet Form L-M, too high, too low, or about right?", nineteen answered "too high", four, "too low", twenty-six, "about right", and one did not respond to the question.

The responses to question three would seem to indicate that a significant portion of the workers in the field have some strong reservations about the validity and usefulness of psychological tests in the diagnosis of mental retardation. Possibly this is a result of misunderstanding about psychological test scores as they relate to mental abilities. Assuming that all of the caseworkers who responded held bachelor level degrees as a minimum, one would wonder if their educational experience had properly exposed them to mental tests and measurements. The responses to question eight also indicate a lack of confidence in psychological tests that

measure mental ability with twenty-four of the fifty respondents indicating the structure of the scoring method was questioned.

Questions four, five, six, and seven were included to sample the field worker's awareness of services provided, his opinion of the adequacy of community services, his opinion of the adequacy of state services provided, and his opinion as to the actual need for special services for the mentally retarded delinquent. To the question, "Do you consider the facilities in your community adequate to work effectively with the mentally retarded delinquents?", forty-four of the respondents answered "no" and six answered "yes". To the question, "Do you consider state facilities, i.e., schools for the mentally retarded, adequate?", forty-four of the respondents answered, "no", four answered "yes", and two said that they were not well enough acquainted with the schools to answer the question. Question six, "Are you acquainted with the resources available at the state level to work with the mentally retarded?", elicited thirty-five "yes" answers and fifteen "no" responses. To the question, "Do you consider the number of children who are referred to your agency that are mentally retarded sufficient to warrant a specific program designed to deal with these children?", forty-nine respondents answered "yes" and one answered "no".

The responses to the above questions suggest that most of the juvenile probation officers believe that adequate resources do not exist in the community to deal with the mentally retarded delinquent although the workers perceive the need for such service.

Most of them indicated that they found the services provided by the state schools inadequate. Thirty percent of the probation officers stated that they were not acquainted with the state resources available to work with the retarded. Perhaps more work needs to be done to help make them more aware of state referral possibilities. Forty-nine of the fifty probation officers consider the number of retarded children handled by their department sufficient to warrant special services for such children.

Question ten was an open question in which the respondents were asked to "list the three most difficult problems that you feel are involved in trying to work with a mentally retarded child on probation." The purpose of this question was to try to ascertain if probation officers from different urban areas of the state were encountering the same problems. Also, it was hoped that the probation officer who has to deal with the problem daily could privide information that would be helpful in formulating recommendations for some solution to the problems under study. The following is a listing of the most frequently expressed problems in the descending order of those most frequently mentioned. Beside each entry is the number of probation officers who listed each problem:

1. Lack of community resources (27)
2. Lack of cooperation and understanding by parents (18)
3. Child's inability to understand the consequences of his acts (14)
4. Inability of probation officer to communicate with the child (13)

5. School problems (13)
6. Peer group exploitation (8)
7. Placement facilities (7)
8. Lack of understanding of probation rules (8)

Analysis of the problems the probation officers listed leads to the conclusion that the probation officer faces a formidable task when dealing with the mentally retarded delinquent. These problems were essentially the same for probation officers throughout the urban areas of the state. As noted in previous responses, they find few resources available to work with the mentally retarded offender. Other problems they mentioned stem from the children's retardation itself. They mention the children's inability to understand the consequences of their acts, inability to understand probation rules, problems communicating with the children, problems in school, and exploitation by their peers. Often noted were significant problems in communicating with the parents of the retarded children and receiving their cooperation and support in carrying out a treatment program.

3.0 SURVEY OF EXISTING COMMUNITY RESOURCES

All of the public as well as private social agencies that existed in Jefferson County were contacted and a personal interview was conducted with supervisors and administrators of these agencies. The basic objectives of these interviews were to determine what programs these agencies might provide for the mentally retarded delinquent, what problems they encountered in working with the mentally retarded delinquent, and what suggestions they might have in developing specialized programs for helping the mentally retarded child who engages in acting out behavior. The agencies contacted included:

1. Neighborhood Youth Corps
2. Beaumont State Center for Human Development
3. Texas Rehabilitation Commission
4. Texas Youth Council
5. Special Education Departments of the Local School Districts
6. Family and Children Services of Beaumont

The private agencies contacted included:

1. Buckner Baptist Benevolence
2. Goodwill Industries, Inc.
3. Fairway Halfway House
4. Services Unlimited, Inc.
5. Beaumont Neurological Center

3.1 Public Agencies

The only federal agency in the county that could provide services for retarded delinquents is the Neighborhood Youth Corps. The Neighborhood Youth Corps is a work training program sponsored by

the Sabine Area Central Labor Council. The goal of the program is to train youths in short term pre-vocational or remedial occupations and then secure permanent placements. A large number of the pre-vocational or remedial occupation placements are provided through other governmental agencies. Interviews with the professional staff of the agency revealed that they do accept mentally retarded youths but experience some difficulty in training those with acting out problems. Mentally retarded youths often have problems accepting supervision. After they have finished their training, job placement presents a problem due to minimum wage laws and the lack of demand for unskilled and semi-skilled workers in the local job market. Since these youths have dropped out of school or have been expelled from public schools, this is another obstacle to employment. The professional staff of the agency recommends that programs in the public schools be expanded for these youths in the area of vocational awareness and pre-vocational training. It was their opinion that the earlier these children are identified and treatment and planning initiated, the better their chance would be once they became old enough to work and benefit from training and job placement.

The state agencies surveyed were the Beaumont State Center for Human Development, Texas Rehabilitation Commission, State Department of Public Welfare, and the Texas Youth Council. The Beaumont State Center for Human Development offers, in conjunction with other agencies, a complete array of services for mentally retarded individuals at the community level. Services offered at

the local level include: diagnosis and evaluation, parent counseling, day care, pre-school training, pre-vocational training and sheltered employment, medical and dental services, and recreational programs. In addition, screening of applicants for placement in state schools for the mentally retarded is also provided. All mentally retarded persons are eligible, however, the Center does not provide services that are the duly authorized responsibility of other state agencies. For example, the Center does not provide education and training for mentally retarded persons who are eligible for public school education and training programs.

For all practical purposes, the Beaumont State Center does not provide assistance to mentally retarded delinquents. Since mentally retarded delinquents are of school age and are eligible for special education, the Center excludes them from their programs. The director of the Center is aware of the problems facing the mentally retarded delinquent and recommends that the public schools provide more programs for these children. In addition, he suggests that a sheltered workshop program be initiated to provide vocational opportunities for these children once they have acquired all the benefit they can from the public school setting.

A counselor for the Texas Rehabilitation Commission who handles only the cases of retarded individuals has an office within the Beaumont State Center for Human Development facility. The goal of this program is the training and eventual employment of re-

tarded individuals. The counselor stated that while he did accept referrals on retarded youths who had acting out problems, they presented special problems. It had been his experience that these youths were not very punctual in their attendance on a job, tended to become easily frustrated, and had difficulty accepting supervision. Furthermore, he noted the lack of support encountered when dealing with these youths as well as the limited job market that was available to them. In terms of the types of programs needed to assist these youths, it was his observation that there was a need for sheltered workshops, expanded pre-vocational programs in the public schools starting at the sixth or seventh grades, and modification of minimum wage laws to open up more opportunities for these youths.

While the State Department of Public Welfare does not provide direct service to mentally retarded youths, they are in a position to provide indirect service through foster care for these children. Often there is an overlap of service to acting out retardates in that the Protective Services Division of the State Department of Public Welfare will have a family under investigation with an abuse or neglect complaint and the Juvenile Probation Department will be working with the child and his family as the result of a police referral. An interview with the Protective Services supervisors revealed that foster placement for a retarded child was difficult at best and for one with acting out problems, it was nearly impossible. The main difficulty was the lack of foster homes and especially the lack of foster placements for minority race children. It was the opinion of the supervisor that expanded

programs in the public schools were needed as well as more foster home placements, sheltered workshops, and possibly group homes.

The Texas Youth Council administers the state correctional facilities for the care of delinquent children. In addition to its institutions, it provides after care parole services to the children who are released for its correctional institutions. The parole officers for Jefferson County were interviewed concerning the problems they encountered when working with the retarded delinquent on parole. They reported that with the children sixteen years or older, there were referral resources such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Texas Employment Commission, and the Texas Rehabilitation Commission. Their problems centered around those retarded children under sixteen years of age who returned from the training school and were re-entered in the public schools. When they returned to the community, there were often placed in grades that were appropriate to their age but not to their achievement or intellectual potential. This causes significant frustration to the child with resulting truancy and acting out behavior. The weak and disorganized families from which many of these children come also cause problems in that they do not carry through with plans made for the children and have difficulty supervising them at home. The Texas Youth Council's parole officers were of the opinion that more special education programs in the public schools were needed along with sheltered workshops.

The local agencies at the public level are the Special Education Departments of the local school districts in the county and the Family and Children Service of Beaumont. The Port Arthur, Beaumont, and South Park Independent School Districts are the largest school districts in Jefferson County and serve the majority of the school age population. Each school district operates special education classes for the mentally retarded. This includes regular classroom instruction for the mentally retarded as well as pre-vocational and vocational training.

The interviews with the directors of the special education departments of the three school districts revealed essentially the same responses. While special education programs were provided for mentally retarded children, those children with acting out problems presented special difficulties. They are not steady in their attendance and often are described as "disruptive influences" by their teachers. They do not respond well to verbal instruction and are often serious discipline problems. In many of the cases, the families of these children are not stable and do not work closely with the school personnel to try to help the child.

The public school personnel described working with mentally retarded children with acting out problems as a very frustrating experience. In terms of what could be done to provide community-based treatment for these children, all agreed that sheltered workshops were a definite need. They also noted that the schools needed more social workers to work with the families of these children and attempt to strengthen the family to the point that

they could support the schools' program. Furthermore, they expressed a need for teaching units to teach the mentally retarded who also suffered from serious emotional problems.

The Family and Children's Service of Beaumont is a multiple-service agency giving casework and group counseling services to families and children. The services are available on an ability-to-pay basis, ranging in cost from nothing to $21.00 per interview. The staff of the agency reported that they received very few referrals from the families of acting out retarded children. On the referrals that they did receive, they reported problems in getting the child in appropriate placement in public schools and getting the families to follow through with plans. In terms of treatment, it was recommended that more programs be made available at the public school level to deal with these children. They also suggested an expansion of vocational training services and sheltered workshops. The need for more family-oriented services to help the families of these children was also stressed.

3.2 Private Agencies

The private non-profit agencies surveyed are Buckner Baptist Benevolence, Goodwill Industries, Inc., Fairway Halfway House, and Services Unlimited, Inc. Buckner Baptist Benevolences operates a children's home as well as providing foster care, mother's aid, and referral services for the other Buckner institutions throughout the state. The Buckner Home in Dallas, Texas, operates a specialized program for retarded children. An

interview with the director of the center revealed that, due to the lack of special education programs in the public schools, it was not always possible to accept retarded children with acting out problems. Mention was also made of the emotional problems that these children often have and their inability to profit from usual treatment modalities. In the area of foster care, the director noted that it was very difficult to find foster care for retarded children, especially those belonging to minority groups. The director of the home suggested that the following services are needed to care for retarded children with acting out problems: improved special education programs in the public schools, sheltered workshops, and family counseling with the families of these children in order to help them learn to better control and provide for the special needs of their children.

Goodwill Industries, Sabine-Neches Division, is a private, non-profit, comprehensive rehabilitation workshop for handicapped individuals in need of employment opportunities. The work adjustment program gives the client an opportunity to develop some basic vocational skills and proper work attitudes. It usually lasts four to six weeks. The client is paid a wage with the final goal of placement in competitive employment. Individuals with physical, mental, emotional, or social conditions which hinder them in obtaining employment on the open job market are accepted for training.

In an interview with the Division Executive, it was found that referrals of mentally retarded persons were accepted. However,

it had been their experience that mentally retarded youths with acting out problems did not work out well in these programs. Immaturity and inability to follow directions and get along with the supervisory personnel and fellow workers were cited as two major problems. Also, several of the youths were not old enough to be placed in employment after training due to prohibitive state and federal laws. The minimum wage law also was an obstacle in placing some of these youths as their production did not equal the minimum wage. The Director of Goodwill Industries was of the opinion that a structured, sheltered workshop would probably be the most beneficial program for these children. He also noted that modification of the minimum wage laws could be of benefit in opening up employment opportunities to many of these youths.

Fairway Halfway House is a halfway house for female and male adult retardates. Its goal is to prepare adult retardates to live in the community. The clients live in the halfway house and work or train in the community. Most of the clients are enrolled in a vocational rehabilitation program and the Texas Rehabilitation Commission bears the cost of their stay.

An interview with the director of the halfway house revealed that, while they usually accept only adults, persons eighteen years old or older, they have on occasion accepted clients as young as sixteen years old. In terms of working with acting out adolescent retardates, the director states that they had not been successful in working with this type of client. They did not adjust well to

the group living situation and were generally not cooperative with the house parents. He recommended that a stronger effort be made in the public schools to provide pre-vocational and vocational education for these youths at an earlier age.

The only sheltered workshop in Jefferson County is Services Unlimited. It provides training and employment in woodworking, plastic and mental engraving, addressing and mailing, and other specialized work from local industries. Application for service is made at the workshop or through the Texas Education Agency, Texas Rehabilitation Commission, and state or local welfare departments. Applicants must be at least seventeen years of age to be accepted. For all practical purposes, the services provided by this agency are not available to retarded delinquents due to the age limitations. It was the opinion of the director of the workshop that retarded adolescents could benefit from a sheltered workshop provided that adequate supervision was available to them. As they did not currently accept adolescents, much less those with a history of acting out behavior, he could not relate any experience that his agency had encountered with retarded delinquents.

The Beaumont Neurological Center is a private institution operated on a profit-making basis. It is a special hospital offering in-patient care of psychiatric patients, a day hospital, out-patient clinic, and vocational rehabilitation. Arrangements for admission are made through the patients' attending physicians. While this facility is primarily designed to care for psychiatric cases,

they do accept referrals on patients that are mentally retarded and have serious emotional problems. Psychotherapy and drug therapy are the primary avenues of treatment.

The psychiatrist at the Center expressed concern about the acting out retarded child but believed that the treatment resources for such individuals at present are limited. It was his opinion that sheltered workshops, vocational training, and supportive therapy were all needed to care for these individuals. Due to the lack of availability of sheltered workshops with supportive environments, he said the treatment possibilities for these children were limited.

The survey of the twelve agencies in the community that provided or might provide services to retarded delinquents yeilded the following results. Educational, vocational, and work opportunities to the mentally retarded delinquent are quite limited. As far as possible agencies to which the probation officer could reasonably refer retarded clients, four were identified. These were: Texas Rehabilitation Commission, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Goodwill Industries, and the public schools.

Even those agencies that accepted referrals on retarded adolescnets were reluctant to work with them for a number of reasons. First, these children appear to have poor work habits that interfere with training and employment. They have difficulty accepting supervision and often have interpersonal problems with fellow workers. The local job market does not supply enough

placements. The families of these children are not considered supportive to the agency that is working with the child. The limitation that the minimum wage law places on employment opportunities was brought out.

Every agency surveyed agreed that education, vocational training, and employment of mentally retarded delinquents was a problem. It was interesting to note the similarities in the suggestions that the agencies' directors made in providing programs to cope with this problem. The most constant recommendation made was for the establishment of sheltered workshops to provide employment and training opportunities as well as supportive services for these children. The need for expanded special education services in the public schools was also cited along with an increase in the number of social workers employed by the schools to help families cope with acting out retardates. The need for modification of minimum wage laws to expand employment opportunities was also often mentioned.

4.0 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study is to describe the mentally retarded delinquent compared to non-retarded delinquents, to describe some of the unique needs of the retarded delinquent, to document the lack of community-based resources to meet the unique needs of the retarded delinquent, and to make recommendations to meet these needs. In approaching the study, three basic questions were asked: (1) Do mentally retarded delinquents differ from non-retarded delinquents and thus require specialized treatment? (2) What are some of the problems that the juvenile probation officer encounters when trying to work with the mentally retarded delinquent? (3) What resources are available for the treatment of the mentally retarded delinquent at the community level?

4.1 Summary

In the research sample of the forty-eight adjudicated delinquents thirty-one percent were found to have IQs of below seventy and were placed in the mentally retarded group. Although the sample was small, the probation officers surveyed agreed with the finding that the number of retarded delinquents were a significant proportion of the total delinquent population. The mentally retarded juvenile delinquent differs from the non-retarded delinquent on eight of the nine characteristics studied. The mentally retarded delinquent tends to be a member of a minority group, is living in a family headed by the natural mother alone, and comes from a poorer family, most often one with a yearly reported income of below $3,000 and receiving public assistance. The mentally retarded delinquent most often comes from a family where siblings

have police referrals and was younger than fourteen at the time of his first police referral. He has had fewer referrals at the time of adjudication than his non-retarded counterparts and is more often found in a correctional institution one year after his court hearing. It is believed that the above data gives further evidence to the already suggested relationship between crime, poverty, and mental retardation.

Questionnaires were sent to the four largest juvenile probation departments in the state. It was believed that the attitudes and opinions of the juvenile probation officers would give insight into the problems faced in dealing with the retarded delinquent and would help formulate recommendations to better help the retarded offender. It was found that the probation officer views intelligence as an important component in anit-social behavior. The mentally retarded offender is considered a poor risk on probation. The probation officers surveyed demonstrate a lack of confidence in psychological tests. Although they perceive the need for special services to help the mentally retarded offender, the probation officers find community and state resources available to them inadequate. Most of the juvenile probation officers do not favor commitment of mentally retarded delinquents to the state training schools although they indicated that there was often no alternative. The probation officers sampled listed many problems they faced as they deal with the retarded delinquent on probation. This included: lack of community resources, lack of understanding and cooperation on the part of the parents, child's inability to understand the consequences of his acts, inability of probation

officer to communicate with the child, school problems, peer group exploitation, lack of placement facilities, and child's inability to understand probation rules.

The data collected on the available community resources suggested that while resources do exist for mentally retarded youths, they in fact are not available for those retarded children with acting out problems. This is not considered an indictment of the agencies surveyed as they had valid reasons for not becoming involved with retarded children with acting out problems. The agencies reported similar problems in working with the acting out retardates: poor work habits, difficulty accepting supervision, interpersonal problems with fellow workers, little or no support from home, limited job placements, and limitations imposed by minimum wage laws. The directors of the agencies surveyed also made similar suggestions regarding methods to deal with the mentally retarded delinquent. The most constant recommendation was sheltered workshops to provide employment and training. The need for expanded special education services in the public schools, and the need for modification of minimum wage laws to expand employment opportunities were also mentioned.

4.2 Recommendations

In order to overcome some of the problems that were identified by this study, the following recommendations have been formulated.

> Recommendation 1: It is recommended that the mentally retarded delinquent be given legal status under the law and the Department of Mental Health and Retardation should be made responsible for those retarded children

that require institutional care.

While these children meet the requirements for service as mentally retarded persons, they are often in effect excluded from these services. At present, the Criminal Justice System receives these children because other institutions are able to exclude them. An expansion of services both on the local and state level will necessarily need to be effected to care for these children. The support of those people involved in the Criminal Justice System as well as in the Mental Health and Retardation field must be secured to implement this recommendation. As long as the Criminal Justice System continues to accept the responsibility for mentally retarded persons, then there is no reason to believe that the necessary services will be forthcoming from other areas.

> Recommendation 2: It is recommended that an effort be made to expand the services provided by the public education system for the mentally retarded.

Because the public school system is the first institution with which a child comes into contact that has a reason to question and examine his mental abilities, their services should be expanded. The public school is usually the institution that diagnoses a child a mentally retarded. Unfortunately, once the diagnosis has been made, adequate treatment programs are not available, especially for those retarded children with acting out problems. It is very important that these children receive proper placement while they are young and still susceptible to change.

Programs should be specifically designed to help the mentally retarded child with acting out problems.

> Recommendation 3: It is recommended that the public schools employ an adequate number of trained casework personnel to work with the families of retarded children with behavior problems.

The mentally retarded delinquent appears to come from what may be considered a multi-problem family. He and his family are greatly in need of adequate supportive services. While these families often receive social services through the Department of Public Welfare, the caseloads of welfare workers are heavy and they are not able to provide the quality of service necessary. As the public schools are usually in closest contact with the families by virtue of having the children in school seven hours a day and dealing with the child's retardation and associated problems, they are probably in a better position to understand the problems of the families than are other agencies.

> Recommendation 4: It is recommended that sheltered workshops be established and expanded to provide job training for acting out retarded children who are old enough to benefit from such training.

Because mentally retarded persons are often not able to compete in the labor market, they are often in need of sheltered workshops that can provide them with training and support and make them at least partly self-sufficient. Such programs are few in number and understandably do not often accept retarded children

with acting out problems. These children present more problems to the personnel of the workshops and thus the administrators usually fill the training slots with persons without behavioral problems who can benefit more from their programs. Such programs could not only provide these youths with opportunities for earning a livelihood, but could bolster their sagging self-esteem and aid in their overall personal and social adjustment. Special care should be taken to provide these youths with support during the training period in order to deal with the problems these children have in accepting supervision and learning punctuality and responsibility.

> Recommendation 5: It is recommended that the private sector of the community be involved in the sheltered workshop program.

Perhaps a program of tax credits could be begun to attract the support of businesses and industries in the community. There is little reason for the workshops if the clients receiving such training cannot find employment in the community upon completion of the training program. Unless incentives can be provided to the private sector to employ persons who receive training in the workshops, there is little reason to suspect that they would do so in large enough numbers.

> Recommendation 6: Modification of minimum wage laws should be considered where they provide a hinderance to employment.

It is recognized that the productivity of some of the mentally

retarded may not justify their receiving the minimum wage. There should be some flexibility to take into account this situation.

> Recommendation 7: It is recommended that probation departments develop in-service training programs to give them a better understanding of mental retardation.

As probation officers appear to have some misconceptions about retarded individuals, special training needs to be given them in order that they may understand and properly evaluate the impact of retardation as it relates to their clients. Special emphasis should be placed on understanding the tests and measurements now in use for diagnosing mental retardation.

> Recommendation 8: It is recommended that more should be included in the correction curriculum at the college level to prepare the prospective probation officer to deal more effectively with mentally retarded delinquents.

The curriculum should be expanded to include more emphasis on the intellectual assessment process, specifically those tests and measurements that diagnose mental retardation. Specific casework techniques need to be outlined in order that prospective probation officers could better understand and serve the needs of the mentally retarded offender.

> Recommendation 9: It is recommended that in the larger probation departments, concentrated casework services be provided for mentally retarded juveniles.

Specially trained caseworkers assigned an optimum number of clients (possibly ten or twelve) could better provide the nec-

essary supervision and treatment that mentally retarded offenders require.

> Recommendation 10: It is recommended that further study be conducted to provide a basic foundation of knowledge of the design and implementation of programs for the retarded delinquent.

It appears that little study has been made into programs to serve the needs of mentally retarded children with acting out problems. It may be that conditions vary in different sections of the country and, therefore, more research is necessary.

While it is well and good that recommendations are made to deal with overall problems, there are limited resources. For this reason, Table 6 is presented as a listing of recommendations that should be given priority.

TABLE 6

Priorities for Implementation of Recommendations

Recommendations	Priority		
	High	Medium	Low
1	X		
2	X		
3			X
4		X	
5	X		
6		X	
7			X
8			X
9		X	
10			X

FOOTNOTES

FOOTNOTES

[1]The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society: A Report by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967, 55.

[2]Robert M. Allen and Sue P. Allen, Intellectual Evaluation of the Mentally Retarded Child: A Handbook, Los Angeles, California, Western Psychological Services, 1970, 1.

[3]Ibid., 1.

[4]Mental Retardation Source Book of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of the Secretary, Office of Mental Retardation Coordination, Washington, D.C., 1972, 15.

[5]Ibid., 16.

[6]Ibid., 97.

[7]Bernard Farber, Mental Retardation: Its Social Context and Social Consequences, Boston, Massachusetts, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968, 11.

[8]Ibid., 11.

[9]Henry H. Goddard, Ph.D., Feeble-Mindedness, Its Causes and Consequences, New York, New York, MacMillan Company, 1923, 12.

[10]Ibid., 4.

[11]Ibid., 7.

[12]Sheldon and E.T. Glueck, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard Press for the Commonwealth Fund, 1950, 399.

[13]Bertran Brown and Thomas Courtless, The Mentality Retarded Offender, Submitted to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Washington D.C., 1967, 559.

[14]O.J. Smith, "Criminality and Mental Retardation," Training School Bulletin, 59, 74-80.

[15]Delton C. Beir, "Behavior Disorders," Mental Retardation, A Review of Research, edited by Harvey A. Stevens and Rick Heber, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1964, 468.

[16]President's Panel on Mental Retardation: Report of the Task Force on Law, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963, 9-10.

[17]Vernon's Texas Civil Statutes, Art. 2338-1, Sec. 16.

[18]Vernon's Texas Civil Statutes, Art. 5143d, Sec. 30.

[19]Vernon's Texas Civil Statutes, Art. 3871b, Sec. 3.

[20]Ibid., President's Panel on Mental Retardation: Report of the Task Force on Law, 16.

[21]Hereafter referred to as the S.I.T.

[22]Richard L. Slosson, Slosson Intelligence Test For Children and Adults, Test Manual, 1963 edition, East Aurora, New York, Slosson Educational Publications, 1963, VI.

[23]Vernon's Texas Civil Statutes, Art. 2338, Sec. 3, Sub. Sec. a-g.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Robert M. and Sue P. Intellectual Evaluation of the Mentally Retarded Child: A Handbook. Los Angeles, California: Western Psychological Services, 1970.

Beir, Delton C. "Behavior Disorders." Mental Retardation, A Review of Research. Edited by Stevens, Harvey A. and Heber, Rick. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Brown, Bertran and Courtless, Thomas. The Mentally Retarded Offender. Washington D.C.: Report to President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967.

Farber, Bernard. Mental Retardation: Its Social Context and Social Consequences. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Glueck, Sheldon and E. T. Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Press for the Commonwealth Fund, 1967.

Goddard, Henry H. Feeble-Mindedness, Its Causes and Consequences. New York, New York: MacMillan Company, 1923.

Knott, Randolph L. "Administrative Dilemmas in Institutional Management of Mentally Retarded Offenders." Paper presented to the Region V Convention of the A.A.M.D., Houston, 1971.

Office of the Secretary. Mental Retardation Source Book of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington D.C.: Office of Mental Retardation Coordination, 1972.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, September, 1967.

President's Panel on Mental Retardation: Report of Task Force on Law. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

Slosson, Richard L. The Slosson Intelligence Test for Children and Adults, Test Manual. East Aurora, New York: Slosson Educational Publications, 1963

Smith, O. J. "Criminality and Mental Retardation." Training School Bulletin, 59.

Texas. Vernon's Civil Statutes, 1965.

APPENDIX A

ILLUSTRATIVE CASE HISTORIES

ILLUSTRATIVE CASE HISTORIES

While it is both necessary and reasonable to collect and analyze facts, often the reality of the problem is lost in such an approach. For this reason, three illustrative case histories of mentally retarded delinquents are presented. Naturally, the names have been changed to protect the privacy of the child and his family. Otherwise, all of the facts are reported as they were recorded in the casefolder. It is hoped that this presentation will provide some material which the reader can identify and relate to actual experience.

Case 1 - James Brown

James is the seventh of thirteen children born to Mr. and Mrs. Brown. The family is intact with this being the first marriage for both parents. Mr. Brown is intermittently employed as a bricklayer's helper. Average yearly income for the family is approximately $4,100. The family's living conditions are extremely crowded and they move approximately twice a year. Five of the thirteen children have been referred to the Juvenile Probation Department and two have been committed to the Texas Youth Council. It was noted that six of the children were under ten years of age. Neither parent has a locally recorded arrest or conviction record.

James was first referred to the Juvenile Probation Department at age thirteen for burglary. His sixteen year old brother was also referred at this time for the same burglary. The intake investigation revealed that James had been taken into custody by the

police three times in the past seven months, twice for truancy and once for shoplifting. On the truancy contacts, the police had returned him to school each time. With the shoplifting offense, he had been counseled by the police and released to his parents. The intake investigation further revealed that the Department of Public Welfare had been in contact with the family on various occasions upon referrals for neglect and temporary relief when Mr. Brown was out of work.

During the initial intake interview with both parents it was found that, while they were concerned, they had so many children and financial problems, that they were simply overwhelmed as to what action to take. The intake worker noted that both parents appeared to be "limited intellectually" and were functional illiterates. The intake decision was to file a petition with the Juvenile Court alleging delinquency and to assign the case to a juvenile probation officer for court preparation and to draw up a treatment plan.

The probation officer paid a visit to the school where James was enrolled and contacted other special agencies that had had contact with the family. The interview with the assistant principal of the school revealed that the whole Brown family was well known to the school authorities. The assistant principal described the family as being very poor with limited intellectual, economic, and social resources. He also described the parents as not being very cooperative and related recent incidents of verbal abuse that he had received from Mrs. Brown. The school

had recently filed on the parents in a local Justice of the Peace Court for not seeing that three of their children attend school on a regular basis. A review of James' cumulative school record revealed that he had always been a poor student academically. He had failed the fourth and fifth grades. Teacher comments included, "slow learner, could do better if he tried, culturally deprived, no help from the home, and would do better if he attended regularly." While James had never received a comprehensive intellectual evaluation, his achievement scores on the standardized achievement tests ranged from the zero percentile to the sixty percentile.

The initial interview with James and his parents led the intake worker to conclude that the parents were simply overwhelmed by their problems and quite frustrated. In a private interview with James, he was not very communicative and at times did not seem to be paying attention. While attempts were made to communicate the impending court procedure as well as the seriousness of his offense, it was not believed that James really comprehended what was happening.

After the initial interview, a tentative casework plan was formulated. This included a complete intellectual evaluation for James and appropriate placement in school based on this evaluation. Furthermore, the family was to be visited every other week for supportive casework. An appointment with the school psychologist showed a full scale I.Q. of fifty-six on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children. The verbal and performance scores were

sixty-two and fifty-eight respectively. Placement in a classroom for the educable mentally retarded was recommended. The school principal advised the probation officer that such a placement was not possible since all special education classes were full and had waiting lists. At this point the probation officer made a referral to the Beaumont State Center for Human Development, a local facility of the Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation. The Center's evaluation revealed an I.Q. of sixty-nine for James on the Stanford-Binet form L-M. It was their recommendation that James be placed in a special education program in the public school. They did not believe that James was retarded enough to benefit from the programs offered at the Center.

James appeared in Juvenile Court shortly after his last evaluation and was placed on probation. One week later he was referred for driving without the owner's consent. A new petition was filed with the court to consider this latest referral. Attempts to keep James in school remained futile. When he did attend school, he was often suspended.

When James appeared in court the second time, the probation department could not offer any plan other than commitment to the Texas Youth Council. Six months after his first referral to the Juvenile Probation Department, James was committed to the Texas Youth Council. James remained in a Texas Youth Council institution for nine months and was returned home on parole to his parents. Six months later he was returned to a Texas Youth Council insti-

tution for a second time for committing burglary, a violation of his parole.

Case 2 - Vernon Key

Vernon, a Caucasian male, was thirteen years and one month old when he was first referred to the Juvenile Probation Department for the burglary of a neighbor's house. The intake investigation revealed that Vernon lived with his father and a deaf stepmother. Mr. Key was steadily employed and demonstrated concern about his child and his current behavior. The initial intake decision was to assign Vernon to a probation officer for a period of voluntary counseling and supervision.

The probation officer found that Vernon was in a special education program and attended school on a regular basis. An evaluation by the school psychologist revealed that Vernon had an I.Q. of sixty-two on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children. The verbal and performance IQs were sixty-seven and sixty-four respectively.

Two months after his initial referral, Vernon was involved in four more burglaries. In each of these referrals, he was involved with children of his age but who were intellectually superior to him. It appeared that the other youths were exploiting Vernon. That is, he had to produce money and articles of value to gain and sustain his friendship with these neighbor children. At this point, attempts were made to find a residential placement for Vernon. Five private and two public institutions

were contacted. It was the same story in each inquiry. The institutions were not equipped to handle mentally retarded children with acting out problems. Application was also made at the Beaumont State Center for Human Development. While they would not accept Vernon for their regular program, the Center did accept him for their summer recreation program.

Vernon appeared in Juvenile Court and was placed on probation. School was over shortly after his court hearing and he was enrolled in the Beaumont State Center's summer recreation program for five hours per day. Vernon was not referred to the probation department during the summer and his parents noted that he was doing quite well at home.

When the summer was over, Vernon was placed back in special education classes in the public school. Six weeks later he was referred for another series of burglaries. At this point he was taken back to the Juvenile Court and committed to the Texas Youth Council.

Case 3 - Mike Johnson

Mike, an eleven year old Negro youth, was first referred to the Juvenile Probation Department for auto theft. He had had two prior referrals to the police department for theft. On both of these occasions he was counseled and released by the police.

The intake investigation revealed that Mike lived with his mother and six siblings. All of the children were the product of two

common law unions. The first father had died four years previously and the second father had abandoned the family several years previously and did not contribute financial or emotional support to the children. The oldest child in the family, a female, was on probation for truancy and shoplifting. It was noted that the mother appeared to be quite intellectually limited and really did not know how to keep house or supervise or take care of her children. The Protective Services Division of the Department of Public Welfare had the family under investigation for a neglect complaint. The caseworkers did not believe that they had any basis for a case because they could not document any evidence of physical abuse.

A review of his school records showed that Mike had been a discipline problem since the first grade but he did attend school on a fairly regular basis. Mike had obtained a full scal I.Q. of sixty-seven on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children. His verbal and performance scores were seventy-one and sixty-four respectively.

Due to the situation within the home, it was decided to see if Mike could be placed in a state school for the mentally retarded. Application was made through the Beaumont State Center for Human Development for placement at the Richmond State School for a thirty day evaluation. Six weeks later, Mike was accepted for this thirty day evaluation. During that six week period he was referred to the probation department for shoplifting and assault. While Mike was at Richmond, an alternative plan of foster care

was developed in case he was sent home rather than enrolled in one of the state school programs. Thirty days after his admission, Mike was returned to the probation department with a recommendation that he be placed in a foster home. He had not received any type of testing or evaluation while at the school. Two weeks later he was returned to Richmond for testing and in-depth evaluation. After another thirty days he was returned home and again a recommendation for foster care was made. In the summary of the report it was stated, "If his foster parents can give him structure and affection, there may be less truancy, less stealing, and less need for state school placement."

Mike was placed in a foster home twenty-six miles from his natural mother's home. Special education placement was secured for him in school. He ran away from the foster home six times within three weeks. After the sixth runaway, the foster parents asked that he be removed from their home. Mike was returned to his mother's home for lack of any other placement. Within three weeks he had accumulated three more police referrals for runaway, truancy, and theft of a lawn mower. He was also suspected of glue sniffing and participating in several coin operated machine burglaries. Mike was taken back to court for theft and committed to the Texas Youth Council. He was twelve years old.

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE PROFILE SHEET

SAMPLE PROFILE SHEET

1. Number of police department referrals _____

2. Type of referrals: theft_____, D.W.O.C._____, assault_____, shoplifting_____, burglary_____, truancy _____, destruction of property_____, other_____.

3. Age at time of first police referral _____

4. Other sibling with police referrals _____

5. Adjudicated offense _____

6. Race: Caucasian____ Negroid____ Mexican American____

7. Receiving an A.F.D.C. check? yes_____ no_____

8. Family income: below $3,000_____; between $3,000 and $4,000_____; between $4,000 and $6,000_____; between $6,000 and $8,000_____; over $8,000_____.

9. Family status:

   a. Natural mother and father in home _____
   b. Natural mother only _____
   c. Natural father only _____
   d. Neither natural parent _____

10. Number of police referrals _____

11. Placed in a correctional institution one year after court hearing? yes_____ no_____

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you feel that mental ability is an important component of anti-social behavior? yes_____ no_____

2. Do you consider a mentally retarded child who had been declared delinquent a good_____, average_____, or poor_____ risk on probation?

3. Do you have confidence in the instruments, i.e., psychological tests, that are currently used in measuring mental abilities? yes_____ no_____

4. Do you consider the facilities in your community adequate to work effectively with the mentally retarded delinquent? yes_____ no_____

5. Do you consider current state facilities, i.e., schools for the mentally retarded, adequate? yes_____ no_____

6. Are you acquainted with the resources available at the state level to work with the mentally retarded? yes_____ no_____

7. Do you consider the number of children who are referred to your agency that are mentally retarded sufficient to warrant a specific program designed to deal with these children? yes_____ no_____

8. Do you consider the present "cut off" scores for diagnosing mental retardation, 70 on the W.I.S.C., W.A.I.S., and Stanford Binet Form L-M, too high _____, too low_____, about right_____?

9. Do you feel that delinquents who have been diagnosed as mentally retarded should be sent to state training school, i.e., reform school, if they fail to make an adequate adjustment on probation? yes_____ no_____

10. Please list the three most difficult problems you feel are involved in trying to work with a mentally retarded child on probation.

    1.
    2.
    3.

PROJECT CAMIO

Correctional Administration and the Mentally Incompetent Offender

Volume 1 Strategies for the Care and Treatment of the Mentally Retarded Offender

Volume 2 Theories on Criminality and Mental Retardation

Volume 3 The Mentally Retarded and the Law

Volume 4 The Mentally Retarded in an Adult Correctional Institution

Volume 5 The Mentally Retarded in a Juvenile Correctional Institution

Volume 6 The Delinquent in a State Residential Facility for the Mentally Retarded

Volume 7 The Mentally Retarded and the Juvenile Court

Volume 8 A National Survey of the Diagnosis and Treatment of Mentally Retarded Offenders in Correctional Institutions